

## **REMARKS**

### **Entry of Amendment And IDS**

As Applicant is filing a RCE herewith, this amendment and the accompanying IDS should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

### **Claims 21-24**

Applicant is canceling Claims 21-24 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112**

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 2-11 and 13-24 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner also rejects these claims under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11. It is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 are clearly supported by the specification of the present application, are enabling, and comply with the written description requirement.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 3, 10, 11 and 22-24 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamaguchi et al. (US 6,222,515). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11. For example, Claim 2 has been amended to recite the feature of “supplying a voltage for a 0th gradation from the D/A converter circuit to the pixel by second scanning signals of the gate driver in a second subframe period.” This feature is supported by, for example, Fig. 1 of the present application. Similarly, Claims 3 and 10 have been amended to recite the feature of “wherein 0<sup>th</sup> gradation voltage is supplied to the pixel in the second subframe period.” Claim 11 has been amended in a similar manner to the other independent claims.

In contrast, Yamaguchi does not disclose or suggest these claimed features.

Therefore, independent Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11, and those claims dependent thereon, are not disclosed or suggested by Yamaguchi and are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

#### Claims 4-9 and 13-18

The Examiner also rejects Claims 4-9 and 13-18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. in view of Katakura et al. (US 6,057,824). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 19 and 20

The Examiner also rejects Claims 19 and 20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Mikami et al. (US 6,825,826) and further in view of Katakura et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this Amendment, the IDS, and/or the RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568